THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.10563 of 2006

Dated: 13-06-2006

Kavali Sathyamma.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Mandal Revenue Officer, Ranga Reddy District.

.....RESPONDENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.10563 of 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner seeks a writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent, namely, Mandal Revenue Officer (MRO), Serilingampally Mandal in taking steps to dispossess her from the land admeasuring Acs.3.00 in survey No.124/ka of Gopanpally village, Serilingampally Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, as illegal and arbitrary. She also seeks a consequential direction to refrain the respondent from dispossessing her.

It is the case of the petitioner that her husband Kavali Mallaiah was the original pattadar and possessor of the land in question. He died on 09-02-2006. The petitioner, therefore, made an application on 16-04-2006 for mutation as per the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971, which is statedly pending before the respondent. It is alleged that on 26-05-2006, the officials from the office of the respondent visited the land and

informed the petitioner that she would be evicted from the government land in survey No.124/ka. Apprehending coercive dispossession, the petitioner approached this Court.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General) and perusing the material placed before this Court, this Court is convinced that the writ petition is filed on mere apprehension. Except making vague statement that the officials from the office of the respondent visited the land and proclaimed that the land is government land, no details are forthcoming in the affidavit accompanying the writ petition. Secondly, even according to the petitioner, the application made by her on 16-04-2006 presumably under Rule 18 of the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Rules, 1989 is pending. Therefore, she may pursue the matter with the respondent in that regard.

The writ petition, which is misconceived, is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

13th June, 2006

ghn